

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 STEVEN R. DAVIS,

Case No. 2:18-cv-00673-JCM-PAL

8 Plaintiff,

ORDER

9 v.

(Mot Stay – ECF No. 42)

10 UNITEL VOICE, LLC, et al.,

(Mot Stay – ECF No. 48)

11 Defendants.

12 Before the court is defendant Unitel Voice, LLC's Motion to Stay Discovery (ECF No. 42).
13 The court has reviewed the motion, and defendants CenturyLink, Inc.'s and Somos, Inc.'s Non-
14 Oppositions (ECF Nos. 46, 47). Rather than filing a response to the motion, plaintiff filed his own
15 Motion to Stay or Modify the Court Order Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 48).
16 The court has also reviewed this motion and defendant Unitel Voice, LLC's Response
17 (ECF No. 53).

18 Defendants' motion requests that this court stay discovery pending ruling on the pending
19 motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (ECF Nos. 10, 26, 43). Defendants argue that
20 because the motions to dismiss are potentially case-dispositive, and discovery is expected to be
21 voluminous any discovery and discovery disputes would become moot as to any defendant
22 dismissed from this matter.

23 Plaintiff's motion also requests that discovery be stayed until decision of the pending
24 motions to dismiss. Alternatively, if the court is not inclined to stay discovery, plaintiff requests
25 a 6-month extension of the current discovery plan and scheduling order deadlines.

26 Having reviewed and considered the matter,

27 **IT IS ORDERED** that:

28 1. The Motions to Stay Discovery (ECF No. 42, 48) are **GRANTED**.

